

Appl. No. 10/629,137
Amdt. dated May 08, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 08, 2006

Docket No. A01181

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1,2, and 4-8 remain in this application. Claims 3 is canceled, without prejudice.

Amendments: Lack of New Matter

Applicant submits that the forgoing claim amendments do not introduce new matter into the present application.

In claim 1, part (iii), lignosulfonic acid polymers are defined as an independent class of suitable polymers in the present specification, p. 34, lines 9-10.

In claim 2, insertion of the word "barrier" improves the clarity of the antecedent basis for the dependence of claim 2 on claim 1.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1: the phrases that are deleted from claim 5 by the current amendments are phrases that repeat material that is already recited in claim 1.

Similarly, the phrases deleted from claim 6 (which depends directly on claim 5 and indirectly on claim 1) merely remove material that was already recited in claim 5 or claim 1. The phrases inserted into claim 6, parts (a) and (c) do not add new matter but clarify the antecedent basis for the recited elements.

The current amendments to claims 6 and 7 do not add new matter but clarify the dependence of claims 6 and 7 on claim 1.

Request for amendments to be entered

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the amendments listed herein above. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter or raise new issues and that they place the present application in better for allowance or appeal.

Response to rejection of claims 1,2, and 4-8 over Gassenmeier

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1,2, and 4-8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over US 2001/00317144 (Gassenmeier).

Appl. No. 10/629,137
Amdt. dated May 08, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 08, 2006

Docket No. A01181

Gassenmeier teaches "laundry, dishwashing, or cleaning product detergent portions with controlled release of active substances" (paragraph [0001]). Gassenmeier's compositions include "(physico)chemical switch(es)" (for example, paragraphs [0016] and [0017]). Gassenmeier discloses embodiments in which "one or more components, when there is a change in the electrolyte concentration in the wash or cleaning liquor, undergo a change in the physical and/or chemical properties" (paragraph [0017]).

Gassenmeier clearly states which polymers are suitable for use in his invention: "Suitable substances which may be used as such (physico)chemical switches are basic in nature and are, in particular, basic polymers and/or copolymers" (paragraph [00122]). Gassenmeier teaches the existence of various types of polymers, and Gassenmeier teaches that some of those are useful for purposes (such as pharmacy) other than Gassenmeier's purposes (paragraphs [00124] and [00125]). Applicants submit that Gassenmeier teaches that basic polymers are suitable as switches, and that Gassenmeier makes no teaching or suggestion that any polymer other than basic polymers could be used as the switch for Gassenmeier's laundry, cleaning, or dishwashing compositions.

In sum, Applicants submit that Gassenmeier's teachings are limited to polymers that act as switches for laundry, cleaning, or dishwashing compositions; that Gassenmeier teaches that basic polymers are suitable as such switches; and that Gassenmeier makes no suggestion that any non-basic polymer could be used as the switch in his compositions.

In contrast, in the triggered response barrier compositions recited in present claim 1, the polyelectrolyte is disclosed to be selected from polymers that are either acid polymers, anionic polymers, or amphoteric polymers. Thus, the polymers recited in present claim 1 are all polymers other than basic polymers. Consequently Applicants submit that the compositions recited in present claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by Gassenmeier. Therefore, Applicants submit that present claim 1 and claims 2 and 4-8, which are dependent (directly or indirectly) on claim 1, are not obvious over Gassenmeier.

Appl. No. 10/629,137
Amdt. dated May 08, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 08, 2006

Docket No. A01181

Response to Double Patenting Rejection

Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herewith, which, Applicants submit, obviates the double patenting rejection over Applications 10/719,167; 10/619,061; and 10/348,375.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the amendments, to reexamine the claimed subject matter, to withdraw the rejections of the claimed subject matter, and to allow claims 1, 2, and 4-8 at this time. If, however, there remain any open issues which the Examiner believes can be resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned agent.

A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith, along with fee of \$130. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the submission of this amendment; however, if any such fees, including petition or extension fees; are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge them, as well as to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 18-1850.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rohm and Haas Company
Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399

Date: May 08, 2006


Carl P. Hemenway
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 51,798
Tel: 215-619-5242
Fax: 215-619-1612